UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,124	10/31/2003	William M. Shapiro	07844-621001	4993

21876   7590   12/10/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

J

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/699,124	SHAPIRO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David García Cervetti	2136	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*21 September 2007*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*10/31/03, 9/21/07.*</u>

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's arguments filed September 21, 2007, have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

2.   Claims 1-57 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Amendment

3.   The amendments to the specification are accepted.

4.   Regarding the arguments against Garcia, Examiner respectfully points to col. 7, lines 20-45, where the structure of the header is described, and further states that the security portion is included in the header, thus it travels with the file, and can therefore be accessed offline. Furthermore, pre-authorizing users is anticipated by Garcia, since a file is created and the members of a group are allowed access to it, i.e. the members of the group are "pre-authorized" to access the file.

5.   Garcia further teaches providing message authentication codes (to authenticate the file has not been tampered with) and doing so using XML, with a pointer pointing to where the security / key / message authentication codes are found (fig. 3B, col. 7, lines 20-45), i.e. synchronization occurs when online. **Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7.   **Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-30, 32-39, and 41-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia (US Patent 7,178,033).**

Regarding claims 1 and 23, Garcia teaches receiving a request from a client
(**col. 11, lines 55-67**); and pre-authorizing the client, in response to the request, to allow
actions by a user as a member of a group of users by sending to the client offline
access information comprising a first key associated with the group, the first key being
useable at the client to access an electronic document while offline by decrypting a
second key in the electronic document (**col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31**).

Regarding claims 12 and 34, Garcia teaches receiving from a document control
server, when online, offline access information comprising a first key associated with a
group of users of the document control server (**col. 11, lines 55-67**); and allowing
access to an electronic document, when offline, by performing operations comprising
using the first key to decrypt a second key in the electronic document and governing
actions with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions
information associated with the electronic document (**col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines
1-31**).

Regarding claims 19 and 41, Garcia teaches encrypting an electronic document
(**col. 11, lines 55-67**); and incorporating into the encrypted electronic document an
address of a document control server, document-permissions information, and an
encryption key useable in decrypting the encrypted electronic document, the encryption
key being encrypted with a key generated by, and associated with a group of users of,
the document control server (**col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31**).

Regarding claims 45 and 56, Garcia teaches a document control server that
synchronizes offline access information with a client in response to a client request, the

offline access information comprising a first key associated with a group, the first key

being useable at the client to access an electronic document by decrypting a second

key in the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67)**; and the client that allows access

to the electronic document, when offline, by a user as a member of the group, using the

first key to decrypt the second key in the electronic document and governing actions

with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information

associated with the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 2 and 24, Garcia teaches wherein pre-authorizing the client

comprises comparing a time of last recorded client-synchronization with a time of last

change in user-group information for the user **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-

65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claims 3 and 25, Garcia teaches wherein pre-authorizing the client

comprises comparing current user-group information for the user with received user-

group information for the user from the client **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 4 and 26, Garcia teaches wherein the client allows actions

with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information

residing in the electronic document **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information further comprises document-permissions information associated with

multiple documents, including the electronic document, and the client allows actions

with respect to the electronic document based on the document-permissions information

(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67).

Regarding claims 6 and 28, Garcia teaches wherein receiving a request

comprises receiving a request from the client to take an action with respect to a second

document **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 7 and 29, Garcia teaches verifying the user at the client as an

authenticated user **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 8 and 30, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific

key, including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information

associated with multiple documents **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 10 and 32, Garcia teaches wherein the at least one set of

document-permissions information comprises one or more policies associated with the

second document, and the offline access information further comprises a document

revocation list **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 11 and 33, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information further comprises at least one set of document-permissions information

associated with a specific document selected based on synchronization prioritization

information **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 13 and 35, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with

respect to the electronic document comprises obtaining the document-permissions

information from the electronic document **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 14 and 36, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with

respect to the electronic document comprises: identifying a document policy reference

in the electronic document; and obtaining locally retained document-permissions

information based on the document policy reference **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines**

22-67).

Regarding claims 15 and 37, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information comprises at least one user-specific key, at least one group-specific key,

including the first key, at least one set of document-permissions information associated

with multiple documents, and a document revocation list **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14,**

lines 22-67).

Regarding claims 16 and 38, Garcia teaches preventing access to the

document, when offline, if a difference between a current time and a receipt time of the

offline access information exceeds a server-synchronization-frequency parameter **(col.**

11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B).

Regarding claims 17 and 39, Garcia teaches wherein the server-

synchronization-frequency parameter is specific to the document **(col. 11, lines 40-67,**

col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B).

Regarding claims 20 and 42, Garcia teaches wherein the encryption key

comprises a session key generated by the document control server, encrypting the

electronic document comprises encrypting the electronic document using a document

key, and incorporating comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic document

a document security payload comprising the document key and the document-

permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted using the

session key **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claims 21 and 43, Garcia teaches wherein the document security

payload further comprises a document identifier assigned by the document control

server, and incorporating further comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic

document a copy of the session key encrypted using a public key associated with the

document control server **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claims 22 and 44, Garcia teaches wherein the document-

permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller

than the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 46, Garcia teaches wherein the electronic document comprises

the document-permissions information **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 47, Garcia teaches wherein the second key comprises a

session key generated by the document control server, and the electronic document

further comprises a document security payload comprising a document key and the

document-permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted

using the session key **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 48, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information

further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific key,

including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information

associated with multiple documents **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claim 49, Garcia teaches wherein the client comprises an agent that

periodically contacts the document control server to synchronize the offline access

information **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claim 50, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises: a server core with configuration and logging components; an internal services component that provides functionality across dynamically loaded methods; and dynamically loaded external service providers, including one or more access control service providers **(col. 16, lines 31-67)**.

Regarding claim 51, Garcia teaches a business logic tier comprising a cluster of document control servers, including the document control server; an application tier including the client comprising a viewer client, a securing client, and an administration client; and a load balancer that routes client requests to the document control servers **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 52, Garcia teaches wherein the client request comprises a request from the client to take an action with respect to a second document **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 53, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises a permissions-broker server including a translation component, the second document comprises a document secured previously by the permissions-broker server, and the translation component being operable to translate first document-permissions information in a first permissions-definition format into second document-permissions information in a second permissions-definition format in response to the request being received from the client **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 54, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a permissions-broker server operable to identify information associated with the second

document in response to the request, the associated information being retained at the

server and indicating a third electronic document different from and associated with the

second document, the server being operable to relate information concerning the third

electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken **(col. 15, lines 29-67,**

col. 16, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 55, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a

permissions-broker server operable to obtain and send, in response to the request, a

software program comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data

processing apparatus to perform operations effecting an authentication procedure, and

the client uses the authentication program to identify a current user and control the

action with respect to the second document based on the current user and document-

permissions information associated with the second document **(col. 15, lines 29-67,**

col. 16, lines 1-31).

Regarding claim 57, Garcia teaches server means for dynamically obtaining

and sending authentication processes in response to client requests to take actions with

respect to electronic documents; and client means for interfacing with a received

authentication process to identify a current user and for controlling actions with respect

to electronic documents based on the current user and document-permissions

information **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31).**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

9.   **Claims 9, 18, 31, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Garcia, and further in view of DeMarines (NPL "Authentica:

Content Security for the Enterprise").

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Garcia does not expressly disclose receiving an

offline audit log from the client. However, DeMarines teaches receiving an offline audit

log from the client **(page 10)**. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide offline audit logs.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a

modification to keep track of offline access to secured files **(DeMarines, pp. 2-3)**.

Regarding claims 18 and 40, Garcia does not expressly disclose maintaining an

offline audit log; and uploading the offline audit log when online. However, DeMarines

teaches maintaining an offline audit log; and uploading the offline audit log when online

(page 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to provide offline audit logs. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to keep track of

offline access to secured files **(DeMarines, pp. 2-3)**.

Conclusion

10.   **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the
references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although
the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to
the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply
as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully
consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed
invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed
by the examiner.

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to David García Cervetti whose telephone number is
(571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and
Thursday-Friday.

13.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

14.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/

                              NASSER MOAZZAMI
                        SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                            TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

                                    12/5/07